

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed December 15, 2005, the examiner set forth a requirement for election under 35 USC 121. In this regard, the examiner erroneously checked box 6 on form PTOL-326 (Office Action Summary) suggesting that as-filed claims 1-34 had been rejected; applicants believe that the examiner intended to check box 8 indicating that the claims 1-34 were "subject to restriction and/or election requirement" – consistent with the examiner's comments on pp. 2-3 of the Office Action. No claim rejections were stated in the Office Action.

More particularly, at pp. 2-3 of the Office Action, the examiner noted the presence of allegedly patentably distinct species shown respectively in FIGS. 5, 10 and 11 of the as-filed application.

In response, applicants hereby elect the embodiment of FIG. 11 for examination on the merits. This election is without traverse.

All of the as-filed claims 1-34 are either generic or otherwise readable upon the elected embodiment of FIG. 11. More particularly, claims 1-2, 6-12, 14-15, 17-19, 26-27, 29-32 and 34 are believed to be generic, and the remaining claims 3-5, 13, 16, 20-25, 28 and 33 are non-generic claims encompassing the elected embodiment.

Applicants reserve the right to pursue non-elected subject matter in a timely filed divisional application

Respectfully submitted,

KELLY LOWRY & KELLEY, LLP


Stuart O. Lowry
Registration No. 26,563

SOL:cw
6320 Canoga Avenue, Suite 1650
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 347-7900